



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| PPLICATION NO. FILING DATE |                 | LING DATE  | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.          | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|-----------------|------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/643,679                 | 9 08/18/2003    |            | Xavier Paliard       | PP01612.009<br>(2300-1612.10 | 4593             |
| 27476                      | 7590            | 11/24/2004 |                      | EXAMINER                     |                  |
| Chiron Cor                 | poration        |            | LI, BAO Q            |                              |                  |
| Intellectual F             | roperty -       | R440       |                      | <u> </u>                     |                  |
| P.O. Box 809               | 97 <sup>°</sup> |            | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER                 |                  |
| Emeryville,                | CA 9466         | 52-8097    | 1648                 |                              |                  |

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |   | Application             | n No.  | Applicant(s)   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|-------------------------|--|----------------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |   | 10/643,67               | 9  | PALIARD ET AL. |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offic   | ce Action Summary   | Examiner                |  | Art Unit       |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   | Bao Qun                 | ··   | 1648           |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| The MA Period for Reply   | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply  |                         |  |                |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |   |                         |  |                |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status  |   |                         |  |                |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1)⊠ Respons   | sive to communication(s) filed on 1   | <u>18 August 2003</u> . |  |                |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| •   | This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.   |                         |  |                |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. |                         |  |                |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Cla  | Disposition of Claims   |                         |  |                |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-8,23-33 and 37-42 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected.  7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-8, 23-33 and 37-42 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.   |   |                         |  |                |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |   |                         |  |                |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</li> <li>11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</li> </ul>   |   |                         |  |                |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 l   | U.S.C. § 119  |                         |  |                |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>  |   |                         |  |                |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | erson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 osure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE   | 3)<br>3/08)             | 4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Dal 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other: | te             | -152) |  |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/643,679 Page 2

Art Unit: 1648

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Amendment filed on 08/18/2003 has been acknowledged. Clams 1-2 and 7-8 have been amended. Claims 9-22, 34-36 and 43-44 have been canceled. Claims 1-8, 21-33, and 37-42 are pending.

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1 and 3-7, drawn to a fusion protein and a composition consisting essential of the fusion peptide or isolated HCV polypeptides, wherein the fusion protein and isolated polypeptides consists essential of NS3, NS4, NS5a, core, classified in class 424, subclass 202.1.
  - II. Claims 2-6, and 8 drawn to a fusion protein and a composition consisting essential of the fusion peptide or isolated HCV polypeptides, wherein the fusion protein and isolated polypeptides consists essential of NS3, NS4, NS5a, NS5b and core, classified in class 424, subclass 202.1.
  - III. Claims 23-33 and 37-41, drawn to a method for activating T cells comprising use of a composition comprising the HCV antigenic polypeptides of NS3, NS4, NS5a and core, classified in class 424, subclass 93.1.
  - IV. Claims23-33, 37-40 and 42, drawn to a method for activating T cells comprising use of a composition comprising the HCV antigenic polypeptides of NS3, NS4, NS5a, NS5b and core, classified in class 424, subclass 93.1.

## The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions Group I and Group II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, the products of group I and group II consisting of structurally different components that produce different immunological effects, for example, product of group I consisting of four HCV antigenic polypeptides, including NS3, NS4, NS5a, and core. It does not contains HCV NS5b antigenic polypeptide, whereas, the product of group II consisting of five HCV antigenic polypeptides, NS3, NS4, NS5a, NS4b and core. Therefore, they have different models of operations and produce different immunological effects.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/643,679

Art Unit: 1648

3. Inventions Group III and Group IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, the methods of group III and group IV have different models of operations, i.e. the method of group III uses an immunogenic composition consisting of four HCV antigenic polypeptides of NS3, NS4, NS5a, and core; whereas, the method of group IV uses an immunogenic composition consisting of five HCV antigenic polypeptides of NS3, NS4, NS5a, NS4b and core. Therefore, they have different models of operations and produce different immunological effects.

- 4. Inventions of group I and group III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product, such as a DNA composition, rather than a protein or polypeptide composition.
- 5. Inventions of group I and group IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product, such as a DNA composition, rather than a protein or polypeptide composition.
- 6. Inventions of group II and group IIII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product, such as a DNA composition, rather than a protein or polypeptide composition.

Application/Control Number: 10/643,679

Art Unit: 1648

7. Inventions of group II and group IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product, such as a DNA composition, rather than a protein or polypeptide composition.

Page 4

- 8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 9. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:
- 10. Species I of epitopes: 1). NS3, 2). NS4, 3). NS5a, 4). NS5b.
- 11. Species II of NS5a sequence i). SEQ ID NO: 1 and ii). SEQ ID NO: 2.
- 12. Species of mammal: a). A mouse, b). A baboon, c). A chimpanzee, and 4). A human.
- 13. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 23, 41 and 42 generic corresponding to species I. Claim 30 is generic corresponding to species II. Claims 24 and 38 are generic corresponding to species III.
- 14. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.
- 15. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 10/643,679

Art Unit: 1648

16. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 17. Claims 23-24 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising A) CD4<sup>+</sup> T cells, B). CD8<sup>+</sup> T cells and C). CD4<sup>+</sup> and CD8<sup>+</sup> T cells. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.
- 18. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.
- 19. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- 20. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 21. Applicants are reminded that in the Office Action the examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection is governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance is governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Art Unit: 1648

22. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bao Qun Li whose telephone number is 571-272-0904. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am to 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on 571-272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bao Qun Li Jaco gian

11/19/2004